



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/643,065	08/18/2003	Bradley Berman	KING. 004CIP1	4199
7590 01/24/2008				
Hollingsworth & Funk, LLC				
Suite 125				
8009 34th Avenue South				
Minneapolis, MN 55425				
		EXAMINER		
		MOSSER, ROBERT E		
		ART UNIT		
		PAPER NUMBER		
		3714		
		MAIL DATE		
		DELIVERY MODE		
		01/24/2008		
		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/643,065

Applicant(s)

BERMAN, BRADLEY

Examiner

Robert Mosser

Art Unit

3714

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/09/2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims **1-42** are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-42, 44-47, 51, and 54-58 of U.S. Patent No. 6,620,045. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because The presented independent claims of the instant application refer to increasing a players odds of receiving a bonus game in exchange for player assets while the '045 patent teaches providing a bonus game in exchange for player assets.

As the presented in the instant Application the terms "odds" includes "odds" equal to 100% and accordingly encompasses providing a bonus game responsive to the exchange of player assets as set forth in U.S. Patent No. 6,620,045.

A terminal disclaimer pertinent to this rejection was received on October 9th, 2007 and is currently pending review.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-16, 18-35, and 37-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) and alternatively under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mayeroff (US 6,186,894).
Claims 1-2, 4, 9, 13-15, 18, 20-22, 27-29, and 37-42 : Mayeroff teaches a method for gaming activity including a base game activity and a bonus game activity alternatively described as a secondary event (Abstract), and further comprising:

receiving an indication from the player to trade player assets for an increased odds of participating in a bonus activity relative to the odds of providing the bonus activity during normal play without the assets traded by the player, through allowing the player to purchase additional active paylines and therefore receiving additional secondary event combination on these additional paylines that would allow the participate in the secondary event(Col 2:46-53, Col 4:51-64, & Col 7:50-55);

receiving an indication of an amount of player assets offered by the player for the trade (Col 2:42-45);

executing the trade by accepting the player assets offered for trade and altering the odds of participating in the bonus activity responsive thereto (Col 7:50-55); and

presenting the player an opportunity to participate in the bonus activity at the altered odds(Col 7:50-55).

In brief summary of the above the invention of Mayeroff allows a player to place a wager amount beyond a base wager amount to purchase/activate additional paylines on a multi-reel slot machine. As the player receives awards including participation in a secondary event based purely on the symbols appearing on the active payline(s) it is inherent that doubling the number of active paylines would result in a doubling of the odds of being awarded a secondary event. As set forth the process continues to be reflective of the additional paylines activated up to at least 8 additional paylines that may be selectively purchased by the player (Col 2:46-53).

Art Unit: 3714

Claims 3, and 19: In addition to the above, Mayeroff teaches providing the player with a “direct chance” during each game play to participate in a bonus game as determined by the game symbol outcome in so much as the game outcome has the potential to be a secondary event awarding combination.

Claims 5-8, and 32-35: In addition to the above, Mayeroff teaches receiving an unsolicited player request initiated by the player and the gaming activity for allowing the player to select at their additional paylines when placing their wager during a the predetermined occurrence of the wagering opportunity (Col 4:54-64, 5:58-6:4). With relation to whether or not the request is initiated by the gaming activity or the player, the request is viewed as mutual event between the player and the gaming activity as both the player and the gaming device must respectively be willing to place and accept a given wager.

Claims 10-11: In addition to the above, Mayeroff teaches allowing a player to place a wager prior to the commencement of the rotation of the game reels and after the conclusion of the reels and settlement of any combination of symbols appearing on the paylines resultant of the rotation (Col 5:60-6:4 & 6:55-63).

Claims 12, and 24: In addition to the above, Mayeroff teaches allowing a player to “double-up” on their wager during the placement of their initial wager at the same time

Art Unit: 3714

the player has the ability to exchange player assets for an improved opportunity of receiving a bonus game (Col 5:58-6:4).

Claim 16: In addition to the above, Mayeroff teaches utilizing player assets acquired through game play (Col 6:55-63) and additionally assets accumulated through the input/deposit of new player assets (Col 5:60-6:4).

Claims 23, 25: In addition to the above, Mayeroff teaches providing a payout result corresponding to a player participation in a bonus/secondary event (Col 8:1-13). The claimed result being provided to the player at a frequency reflective of the trade value is understood as being encompassed through Mayeroffs' presentation of additional participation opportunities as discussed in the rejection of at least claim 1 above.

Claim 26: In addition to the above, Mayeroff teaches accepting wagers according to pre-configured criteria (Col 2:46-48).

Claims 30-31: In addition to the above, Mayeroff teaches a separate bonus/secondary game independent of the based game mode of play (Figure 1, Col 7:56-), and after the completion of the bonus event allowing the player to participate in the standard mode of play through the placement of an additional wager (Claim 1, Col 5:60-6:8).

Claim 38: In addition to the above, Mayeroff teaches that the use of video displays representation of slot reels is known in the art (Col 4:29-34).

Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Baerlocher et al (US 6,599,192).

Baerlocher et al teach awarding a player increased odds of participating in a Bonus activity through normal play through the awarding of a bonus game and receiving an input by the player to opt out of a the bonus activity in exchange for a payout amount, and resultant thereof awarding the player a payout and terminating the increased odds for participating in a bonus activity through returning the player to the base game (Abstract, Figure 6, Col 6:36-7:13).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims **17** and **36** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayeroff (US 6,186,894).

Mayeroff teaches the invention as presented above however, is silent regarding the incorporation of allowing the player to select from multiple bonus game types. The Examiner gives Official Notice that including a plurality of selectable bonus games and allowing a player to select their bonus game type from a plurality of bonus games is old and well known in the art of gaming. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have incorporated the multiple player selectable bonus games as into the invention of Mayeroff in order to provide the player with variety in their gaming experience thereby adding to the players enjoyment and excitement.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed October 9th, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Starting on page 10 of the Applicant's remarks they argue that assets wagered in the main game of Mayer are allocated in the main game of Mayeroff. This point regardless of its validity or lack thereof is not reflective of the presented claim scope and therefore cannot provide a separation between the claimed invention and the prior art.

On page 11 of the Applicant's remarks the Applicant presents arguments directed to a narrow interpretation of what would constitute a "standard gaming activity". The Applicant's arguments directed to what may or may not constitute a standard gaming activity are not fairly represented in the pending claims. In similar light to the

Art Unit: 3714

above the pending claims set forth at least two gaming activities and are silent with regards to when defined player exchanged takes place. Simply put, under the present claim language and scope, the claims do presently encompass the purchase of additional paylines wherein it is understood that each additional payline yields an additional opportunity to achieve a game result yielding a bonus game/event (Mayeroff Col 3:60-64). Reflective of the above the placement of a minimum wager and selection of the minimum number of paylines is readily correlated to a "standard gaming activity".

On page 12 of the Applicant's remarks the Applicant states "...the Office Action provides no indication of Mayeroff describing an increased chance of reaching a bonus activity" and seemingly dismisses the acquisition of additional payline by the player as meeting this limitation. The fact that this feature is recognized by the applicant and even cited by the Applicant with respect to Mayeroff on page 11 of their remarks sets forth a seemingly contradictory interpretation. The relevant citation (Mayeroff Col 3:60-64) clearly states that the number of chance of acquiring the bonus round result from the player election to play more paylines, yet that Applicant's arguments that this would in turn not be equivalent to an increased chance of reaching a bonus round is to say at the least puzzling argument, given the scope of what constitutes a standard gaming activity discussed above.

Applicant's further arguments as presented on pages 13 through 18 of their remarks generally reiterate the Applicant's previously presented comments on pages 10 through 12 with the incorporation of the particular claim language of the claims discussed therein. The various particular claim verbiage however commonly attempts

Art Unit: 3714

to set forth a delineation between a standard mode of play and a generally described enhanced mode of play. As discussed above this separation as suggested by the Applicant is not presently defined within the claim scope as so argued by the Applicant.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Mosser whose telephone number is (571)-272-4451. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-4:30 Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pezzuto can be reached on (571) 272-6996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3714

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/RM/
January 14th, 2008


ROBERT E. PEZZUTO
SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER